



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,912	12/08/2000	Eric Allan Bier	1508-3220	1180

7590 06/07/2010  
Gunnar G. Leinberg, Esq.  
NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Clinton Square  
P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, NY 14603

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/07/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/731,912	BIER, ERIC ALLAN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CHAU NGUYEN	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15,16,18-21,23-34,37,38,41,42,45 and 49-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15,16,18-21,23-34,37,38,41,42,45 and 49-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 03/15/2010 has been entered. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-16, 18-21, 23-34, 37-38, 41-42, 45 and 49-51 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims 49-51 contain subject matter **“perform a check as to whether a syntax of a template item modified by an author matches a syntax of the template information edited by a user, if not, displaying an error message on a display device and if matching, storing the edited template information in a storage device; merging one or more parts of the modified template item in comparison with the edited template information based on the check performed back into the electronic document”** which were not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant pointed out page 8, lines 2-8 of the Specification which would support this limitation. The Examiner disagrees. Applicant recites “a user then edits, for example, with the input device 240, the template. Upon completion of the edit, the

Art Unit: 2176

template edit device 160 verifies the syntax of the template. If the syntax is acceptable, the updated template is temporarily stored. Otherwise the template edit device 160 generates a message for display on the display device 220 indicating that there is a syntax error" (see page 8, lines 4-8 of the Specification). Thus, for the purpose of this examination, the Examiner interprets the claims 49-51 as if the Applicant describes in page 8, lines 4-8 of the Specification.

4. Claims 1, 12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims 1, 12 and 20 contain subject matter "a template edit merging device that merges a modified item template back into the electronic document even if the user edits the content of one or more items managed by the item template in the actively live web page, **while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document**" (emphasis added), which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant pointed out paragraph [0054] of the Specification which would support this matter. However, the Examiner disagrees. Paragraph [0054] recites "it is possible for the page author to modify **an item template** at the same time that the contributor is adding or editing **items** to a page" (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret the recited paragraph [0054] as "the **same** item template for which

Art Unit: 2176

the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document" (Applicant claims in claim 1, 12 and 20). Instead, one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the recited paragraph [0054] as "the page author modifies an item template (of a page) at the same time that the contributor (user) is adding or editing items (other items or other items template) to the page". Therefore, for the purpose of this examination, the Examiner reads "**while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document**" as "the page author modifies an item template (of a page) at the same time that the contributor (user) is adding or editing items (other items or other items template) to the page".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-16, 18-21, 23-34, 37-38, 41-42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) being unpatentable over Bay-Wei Chang, "In-Place Editing of Web Pages: Sparrow Community-Shared Documents", published 04/1998 (hereinafter Chang), in view of Giljum et al. US006745238B1- filed 03/31/2000 (hereinafter Giljum '238), and further in view of Zhu et al, US Patent No. 6,654,032 (hereinafter Zhu).

**In regard to independent claim 1, A group-editable web page editing system comprising:**

**an element selection device adapted to select a portion of an electronic document, wherein the selected portion includes at least one of template information or formatting information each associated with a corresponding item template stored within the electronic document** (the Chang reference describes the claimed group-editable web page editing system, in the form of in-place editing of Sparrow community-shared web page documents (Chang's Title, page 1). The Chang reference further describes the claimed an element selection device that selects a portion of an electronic document, wherein the selected portion includes information stored within the electronic document, in the form of clicking on a black triangle (page 3, lines 2-3 and Figure 2), and the information selected in Chang is content information. The Chang reference further describes each Sparrow area on a page consists of a number of similar items, each of these items types is described by its own template (page 10, section 4.1)).

**an editing hardware device adapted to determine an edit user interface and allows editing of the selected portion through the edit user interface, wherein the edit user interface allows editing of at least one of the template information or the formation information of the selected portion** (The Chang reference describes the electronic document is an HTML document with template, formatting, and content information (page 5, lines 16-19, page 11, line 5, pages 11-12, section 4.1, and pages 13-14, section 4.5). The Chang reference also describes the formatting information

Art Unit: 2176

comprises codes which are distinct from editable content items. Page 14 shows standard “<B>” and “</B>” HTML bold formatting information stored within the electronic document and distinct content information “Abe L.” stored within the document. The Chang reference further describes that the formatting information is editable by an authorized user (page 11, line 2);

**and an updating device adapted to replace the selected portion with the edited portion** (The Chang reference describes the claimed an updating device that replaces the selected portion with the edited portion, in the form of supplanting the original (page 4, lines 3-5).

Chang teaches the desirability of editing template or format information (page 11, line 2). To support the teaching of Chang, Giljum teaches that it is desirable to edit the template or “style” and edit the formatting or “fonts” of web pages (col. 8, lines 3-5 and col. 8, lines 52-54).

Thus both Chang and Giljum provide a sufficient suggestion to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang’s system to include group editing of template or formatting information in addition to Chang’s group editing of content information.

**a template edit merging device that merges a modified item template back into the electronic document even if the user edits the content of one or more items managed by the item template in the actively live web page, while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by the author of the electronic document** (Chang teaches

Art Unit: 2176

merging first modified content information back into the electronic document even if second content information was altered while the first information was modified (page 7, lines 16-19; and page 14, section 4.6). That is, “pages are not locked during [group] editing” and edits must be resolved by the user only if “an edit to the [same] item has occurred.” (Chang, page 14). Thus, the Chang reference provides a sufficient suggestion to those skilled in the art to modify the Chang system to permit merging of modified first information back into the electronic document even if second information was altered while the first information was modified, so long as the first and second information are not the same information. The Chang reference teaches that the contributor (user) makes changes to the item (element), and when he is done making changes to the item, and clicks the “OK” button, Sparrow makes the change to the web page and redirects the user’s browser back to the original URL, which now shows the newly altered page (page 5, lines 1-4). The Chang reference further discloses checking if the sequence numbers of the edited version (by user) of the item and of the version of the item stored in the files system (by an author) differ, then an edit to the item has occurred while the user was himself editing the item (page 14, section 4.6). The Chang reference further discloses Sparrow providing editing of specific parts of web pages (by contributor or user), not entire web page, and the web page author creates the entire page, and adds Sparrow capability to the parts he or she wishes to have people contribute to, and the items in the Sparrow-enabled parts can be edited and added to, forming growing lists of items (page 5, third paragraph). In addition, as pointed out in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph to claims 1, 12 and 20, the Examiner



Art Unit: 2176

reads "**while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document**" as "the page author modifies an item template (of a page) at the same time that the contributor (user) is adding or editing items (other items or other items template) to the page", which was taught by Chang (page 13, section 4.6: one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users who are editing other items on the same page).

The Chang reference further describes an edit merging device that merges first modified content information back to into the electronic document even if second content information was altered while the first information was modified (page 7, lines 16-19, page 14, section 4.6). Thus these imply the updated web page is merged with the "live" version of the web page.

To support the implication of Chang, Zhu teaches a conferencing server distributes the shared screen (electronic document) to a plurality of remote clients, each of the remote clients having a viewer application to display the share screen, and the shared screen being simultaneously displayed during the live data conference (col. 11, lines 11-18). Zhu further describes receiving user input form one of the remote clients and drive the application to edit the application screen based on the user input to produce an application screen update which is used to create a shared screen update (col. 11, lines 19-29). Zhu further describes sending the shared screen update to the conferencing sever, and the conferencing server distributes the shared screen update to

Art Unit: 2176

the remote clients, and the shared screen update being simultaneously displayed during the live data conference (col. 11, lines 30-38).

Thus both Chang and Zhu provide a sufficient suggestion to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang's system to include merging the update information edited from the user input to create shared screen update being simultaneously displayed during the live data conference in addition to Chang's merging the modify content information back into the electronic document.

**In regard to independent claims 12 and 20**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale. Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein a user interface would have been an obvious variant of users' computers and user manipulation of a graphical user interface, to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to dependent claim 2**, Chang teaches wherein the updating device accounts for one or more edits by other users (The Chang reference discloses members of a page or document will make changes and add to the page (page 2, lines 4-6). The Chang reference further describes the claimed an updating device that replaces the selected portion with the edited portion, in the form of supplanting the original (page 4, lines 3-5)).

**In regard to dependent claim 3**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale; **accounts for one or more edits by other users and are**

Art Unit: 2176

**stored in a queue** (as taught by Chang, page 1, Introduction Section, discloses the Web pages are jointly edited by more than one person, much meta-information about the page must be distributed in addition to its URL: who is currently editing the page, where the page is stored in the files system, who has permission to write to that file system, and so on. Chang further discloses in page 9, section 3.3 showing editing by multiple people are recorded in a table as a queue).

**In regard to independent claim 5**, Chang discloses wherein the updating device updates the selected portion dependent on the edited portion (page 4, lines 3-9: when the contributor is done with making changes to the item, the contributor clicks the "OK" button to make the change to the web page and redirects the user's browser back to the original URL with newly altered page).

**In regard to dependent claim 6**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

**represents at least one non-selected portion of the electronic document with a place holder while the selected portion is being edited and wherein the edit user interface suppresses one or more non-selected portions of the electronic document while the selected portion is being edited** (Chang at page 7, section 2.2, discloses a lightweight editing technology for the Web, wherein one item at a time being edited using "Editing in-place", and during editing, the context of the rest of the page remains in place. The metaphor used is that of the outliner: the triangle graphic turns downwards to open up a region holding more detail, in this case, an editing region.

Art Unit: 2176

Meanwhile, the page content above and below the editing region remains unchanged and visible. The user is free to browse the rest of the page even when editing, Chang at page 1, Introduction section, prescribing the types of editing allowed, and presenting forms for user interaction. In addition the interface attempts to leverage existing conventions in order to allow first-time users to feel comfortable initiating an edit without prior instruction) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein place holder would have been an obvious variant of the editing region remains unchanged and visible and presenting forms for user interaction, to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to dependent claim 7**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 and 6 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

13, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 8, the element selection device permits selection of all portions of the electronic document that are associated with a given portion class** (Chang at page 10, section 3.3, Interview schedule, discloses the interview schedule which is an example of a class of Sparrow pages...), and also at page 13, section 4.4 Fields, Python subclass.

**In regard to dependent claim 9, the portion classes include the class of items, the class of templates, and the class of remaining code** (Chang, at page 11, section 4.1 paragraph 1, Sparrow provides flexible authoring for creating many different kinds of content. Sparrow items are specified declaratively, by creating a template that includes the fields that will be used and the HTML formatting around the field entries...).

**In regard to dependent claim 10, a user may select and edit portions of the template class, while one or more other users may simultaneously edit portions of the item class** (Chang, at page 14, section 4.6, paragraph 1, discloses a method, wherein one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users who are editing other items on the same page...).

**In regard to dependent claim 11, one user may select and edit portions of the remaining code class** (Chang, at page 15, section 5 paragraphs 5, discloses Web Edit [6], Web Writer [2, 3], and Wiki Web all implement browser-based editing of Web pages. Like Sparrow, these systems allow one to edit pages directly within the browser, thus freeing the user from starting another tool or knowing where the page is stored on the filesystem. Unlike Sparrow, they require knowledge of HTML and editing occurs over the entire contents of a page...).

**In regard to dependent claims 13 and 21, Chang teaches wherein the replacing device accounts for one or more edits by other users** (The Chang reference discloses members of a page or document will make changes and add to the page (page 2, lines 4-6). The Chang reference further describes the claimed an updating device that replaces the selected portion with the edited portion, in the form of supplanting the original (page 4, lines 3-5)).

**In regard to dependent claims 15, Chang discloses wherein the edit user interface displays a placeholder corresponding to at least one non-selected portion and the selected portion while the selected portion is being edited and wherein the edit user interface suppresses one or more non-selected portions of**

Art Unit: 2176

**the electronic document while the selected portion is being edited** (Chang at page 7, section 2.2, discloses a lightweight editing technology for the Web, wherein one item at a time being edited using “Editing in-place”, and during editing, the context of the rest of the page remains in place. The metaphor used is that of the outliner: the triangle graphic turns downwards to open up a region holding more detail, in this case, an editing region. Meanwhile, the page content above and below the editing region remains unchanged and visible. The user is free to browse the rest of the page even when editing, Chang at page 1, Introduction section, prescribing the types of editing allowed, and presenting forms for user interaction. In addition the interface attempts to leverage existing conventions in order to allow first-time users to feel comfortable initiating an edit without prior instruction) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein place holder would have been an obvious variant of the editing region remains unchanged and visible and presenting forms for user interaction, to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to dependent claims 16, Chang discloses updating another portion of the electronic document** (page 5, last paragraph: contributors add or edit just one item at a time, and this makes it easier for users to make small changes or updating other portions of the page).

In regard to dependent claims 18, **Chang discloses replacing one or more non-selected portions with a placeholder** (Figure 2 and page 3 show the web page include 2 non-selected portions “Complete Ch. 15 of documentation” and “Place links”

Art Unit: 2176

which are attached with black triangle and when the contributor clicks on the triangle which will cause the item to open into a dialog-box-link region (placeholder) to allow editing of the item).

**In regard to dependent claim 19, the electronic document comprises items, templates, and code** (Chang, at page 11, section 4.1 paragraph 1, Sparrow provides flexible authoring for creating many different kinds of content. Sparrow items are specified declaratively, by creating a template that includes the fields that will be used and the HTML formatting around the field entries...).

In regard to dependent claims 23, **wherein the edit user interface displays a placeholder corresponding to at least one non-selected portion and the selected portion while the selected portion is being edited and wherein the edit user interface suppresses one or more non-selected portions of the electronic document while the selected portion is being edited** (Chang at page 7, section 2.2, discloses a lightweight editing technology for the Web, wherein one item at a time being edited using "Editing in-place", and during editing, the context of the rest of the page remains in place. The metaphor used is that of the outliner: the triangle graphic turns downwards to open up a region holding more detail, in this case, an editing region. Meanwhile, the page content above and below the editing region remains unchanged and visible. The user is free to browse the rest of the page even when editing, Chang at page 1, Introduction section, prescribing the types of editing allowed, and presenting forms for user interaction. In addition the interface attempts to leverage existing conventions in order to allow first-time users to feel comfortable initiating an edit without

Art Unit: 2176

prior instruction) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein place holder would have been an obvious variant of the editing region remains unchanged and visible and presenting forms for user interaction, to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**In regard to dependent claims 24, Chang discloses updating another portion of the electronic document** (page 5, last paragraph: contributors add or edit just one item at a time, and this makes it easier for users to make small changes or updating other portions of the page).

**In regard to dependent claim 25,** Chang discloses instructions for processing any user contributions stored in a queue (Chang, page 1, Introduction Section, discloses the Web pages are jointly edited by more than one person, much meta-information about the page must be distributed in addition to its URL: who is currently editing the page, where the page is stored in the files system, who has permission to write to that file system, and so on. Chang further discloses in page 9, section 3.3 showing editing by multiple people are recorded in a table as a queue).

**instruction that unlocks the electronic document...** however (Giljum '238 at col. 12, line 30 through col. 13, line 50, also see Fig. 10 through Fig. 13, provides a mechanism to grant folder privileges to groups, wherein the Web Site Database includes an interface for adding new items (e.g., the files, text and URLs) to the Web Site. In addition, this interface permits the user, with the proper privileges user s are providing "check out item" (e.g. no other contributor may edit the item) tool applies only to items enabled for check out and a "checked-in item" tool permits a contributor to



Art Unit: 2176

return the updated item to the folder after editing it) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein instruction that unlocks the electronic document would have been an obvious variant of a "checked-in item" tool permits a contributor to return the updated item to the folder after editing it (e.g.. Web Site), to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang's teaching, discloses a group-editable web page editing system comprising: formatting information stored within the electronic document, and an updating device that replaces the selected portion with the edited portion, to includes a means of instruction that unlocks the electronic document of Giljum '238. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enable the content contributor (e.g. to create a web site, the person, referred to as the content contributor, submits the content (e.g., files and images) to the web site administrator for publication) may not be technical and may not have any knowledge of HTML, and eliminating a bottleneck the web site administrator prior to publishing the content, and ensuring that the content is up to date and accurate (as taught by Giljum '238 at col. 1, lines 30-55).

**In regard to dependent claims 26, Chang discloses replacing one or more non-selected portions with a placeholder** (Figure 2 and page 3 show the web page include 2 non-selected portions "Complete Ch. 15 of documentation" and "Place links" which are attached with black triangle and when the contributor clicks on the triangle

which will cause the item to open into a dialog-box-link region (placeholder) to allow editing of the item).

**In regard to dependent claim 27, Chang discloses the electronic document comprises items, templates, and code** (Chang, at page 11, section 4.1 paragraph 1, Sparrow provides flexible authoring for creating many different kinds of content. Sparrow items are specified declaratively, by creating a template that includes the fields that will be used and the HTML formatting around the field entries...).

**In regard to dependent claims 28, 30 and 32, Chang discloses a plurality of editing devices each with a different edit user interface, wherein one of the edit user interfaces from one of the plurality of editing devices is selected for the editing of the selected portion** (page 2, section 2 – page 4, line 16: Chang discloses a web page “zeta.html” includes different editing devices, each associates with a black triangle: clicking on a black triangle causes the item to open into a dialog-box-like region to allow editing of the item).

**In regard to dependent claims 29, 31 and 33, Chang discloses wherein the electronic document is a web page and the plurality of editing devices are each different web page editing devices** (page 2, Figure 1 shows the document “zeta.html” is a web page; page 2, section 2 – page 4, line 16: Chang discloses a web page “zeta.html” includes different editing devices, each associates with a black triangle: clicking on a black triangle causes the item to open into a dialog-box-like region to allow editing of the item).

**In regard to dependent claims 34, 38 and 42,** Chang discloses wherein the formatting information comprises at least one of text, images, and formatting codes editable by one or more authorized users, and wherein the formatting information is distinct from editable content items of the electronic document (page 5, lines 16-19, page 11, line 5, pages 11-12, section 4.1, and pages 13-14, section 4.5: Chang describes the electronic document is an HTML document with template, formatting and content information, the formatting information comprises codes which are distinct from editable content item. Page 14 shows standard “<B>” and “</B>” HTML bold formatting information stored within the electronic document and distinct content information “Abe L.” stored within the document. Chang further describes that the formatting information is editable by an authorized user (page 11, line 2).

**In regard to dependent claims 37, 41 and 45,** Chang discloses wherein the placeholders representing non-selected portions of the electronic document are displayed in the same order as the corresponding non-selected portions of the electronic document (Figure 2 and page 3 show the web page include 2 non-selected portions “Complete Ch. 15 of documentation” and “Place links” which are attached with black triangle and when the contributor clicks on the triangle which will cause the item to open into a dialog-box-link region (placeholder) to allow editing of the item, and each of dialog-box-link region is displayed in the same order as the non-selected portions “Complete Ch. 15 of documentation” and “Place links”).

7. Claims 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, Giljum and Zhu applied to claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-16, 18-21, 23-34, 37-38, 41-42

Art Unit: 2176

and 45 above and further in view of Crespo and Bier, "WebWriter: A Browser-Based Editor for Constructing Web Applications" (Applicant's IDS), published in 1996 (hereinafter Crespo-Bier).

**In regard to dependent claims 49, 50 and 51, Chang discloses performing a check as to whether a template item modified by an author matches the template information edited by a user during the content item modification, if matching, storing the edited template information in a storage device, merging one or more parts of the modified template item in comparison with the edited template information based on the check performed back into the electronic document** (The Chang reference teaches that the contributor (user) makes changes to the item (element), and when he is done making changes to the item, and clicks the "OK" button, Sparrow makes the change to the web page and redirects the user's browser back to the original URL, which now shows the newly altered page (page 5, lines 1-4). The Chang reference further discloses checking if the sequence numbers of the edited version (by user) of the item and of the version of the item stored in the files system (by an author) differ, then an edit to the item has occurred while the user was himself editing the item (page 14, section 4.6). The Chang reference further describes an edit merging device that merges first modified content information back to into the electronic document even if second content information was altered while the first information was modified (page 7, lines 16-19, page 14, section 4.6).

Chang, however, does not explicitly disclose checking whether a syntax of a template item modified by an author matches a syntax of the template information edited by a user, if not displaying an error message on a display device.

Crespo-Bier disclose the Page Generator generates a new page on the fly (based on a template page) as it scans through the template page, as the Page Generator reads, it copies each character to its output stream, until it encounters a [!variable] string or an <OUTPUT> tag (syntax), it looks up the value of the variable from the variable=value pair that it received, If it finds a match it replaces [!variable] with the value as a string, and if it finds no match, it generates an error page (page 17 - section The WebWriter Page Generator).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Crespo-Bier with Chang to include checking whether a syntax of a template item modified by an author matches a syntax of the template information edited by a user, if not displaying an error message on a display device for the purpose of

### ***Response to Arguments***

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

A) Applicant has requested reconsideration and withdrawal of 101 rejection.

In reply to argument A, Claim 20 recites a “computer readable medium” storing instructions that perform various steps, and the steps are software per se. Applicant has amended the Specification to include "An information storage media comprising:

Art Unit: 2176

information that selects one or more portions of an electronic document; information that determines an edit user interface for the one or more selected portions; information that edits the one or more selected portions; and information that replaces the one or more selected portions based on one or more edited portions" (see Specification dated 03/15/2010). Thus, Applicant refers the recited "computer readable medium" to the "storage medium" as disclosed in the Specification. For this reason, the recited "computer readable medium" is statutory. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is withdrawn. However, the Examiner suggests Applicant to modify the "computer readable medium" in claim 20 to the "computer storage medium" for consistency with the Specification.

B) Applicant has requested reconsideration and withdrawal 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection to claims 49-41.

In reply to argument B, please see the explanation above for the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection.

C) Chang, Giljum and Zhu, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the limitation "a template edit merging device that merges a modified item template back into the electronic document even if the user edits the content of one or more items managed by the item template in the actively live web page, while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document."

Art Unit: 2176

In reply to argument C, Applicant pointed out paragraph [0054] of the Specification which would support this limitation. However, the Examiner disagrees. Paragraph [0054] recites "it is possible for the page author to modify **an item template** at the same time that the contributor is adding or editing **items** to a page" (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret the recited paragraph [0054] as "the **same** item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document" (Applicant claims in claim 1, 12 and 20). Instead, one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the recited paragraph [0054] as "the page author modifies an item template (of a page) at the same time that the contributor (user) is adding or editing items (other items or other items template) to the page". Therefore, for the purpose of this examination, the Examiner reads "**while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document**" as "the page author modifies an item template (of a page) at the same time that the contributor (user) is adding or editing items (other items or other items template) to the page", which was taught by Chang (page 13, section 4.6: one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users who are editing other items on the same page).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am – 5:30 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chau Nguyen/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2176